



CENTRE FOR  
HUMANITARIAN  
LEADERSHIP

# Transformation in the aid and development sector?

## Localisation



# Transformation in the aid and development sector?

## Localisation

The term localisation now sits at the forefront of current discussions on reforms in the humanitarian system. This term gained widespread recognition following the Charter for Change 2015 commitments<sup>1</sup> towards more locally-led responses, and was written around the same time as the World Humanitarian Summit, intended to provide a counterpoint to the Grand Bargain.

In its original framing, the concept of localisation was defined as a process of giving more decision-making agency, funding, leadership, and power to local and national actors throughout all stages of a humanitarian response. It is based on the premise that local people affected by crises have long been excluded by the international community from decision making that affects them despite their greater understanding of the local context and needs, and that funding models favour large INGOs, leaving local non-governmental organisations (LNGOs) under resourced despite the fact that they are the first to respond and the last to leave, and carry the burden of risk in fragile settings. Other humanitarian actors also [examine](#) the challenges and potential for impact that localisation could have on maintaining humanitarian principles in distinct settings (i.e., conflict and fragile settings).<sup>2</sup>

Over time, however, as demands for localisation have come to the forefront of humanitarian policy discussions, it is clear that there is no universally accepted definition of 'localisation'. In the sector, there is a continuum of discussion from humanitarian actors and practitioners around agreed definitions and terminologies and the myriad definitions as to what counts as localisation.

For instance, some humanitarian actors including the global Alliance 4 Empowering Partnerships [do not endorse](#) the inclusion of any local or national NGO, or intermediaries based in the global south that may be affiliated to an INGO as a local actor,<sup>3</sup> while other humanitarian actors such as INGOs (intermediaries) sit on the other end of the spectrum. Further, some specialists [observe](#) the term 'localisation' "has been critiqued and rejected by many,"<sup>4</sup> in which its use can have the adverse impact of reinforcing traditional power dynamics. Keeping in mind these considerations, this report uses the language of 'localisation', given its widely used and understood terminology, while recognising that this terminology can be problematic.

While localisation as a framework has its challenges, this series collates a range of initiatives and steps taken by actors in the sector, both conceptually and operationally, as efforts to initiate change.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Charter 4 Change (2015). Accessible at: <https://charter4change.org/>

<sup>2</sup> 'The challenges of localised humanitarian aid in armed conflict', Emergency Gap Series, MSF (2016), p. 3

<sup>3</sup> 'IASC Definition of 'Local' and 'National Actors' – a barrier to achieving Grand Bargain localisation commitments', Alliance for Empowering Partnerships (2019), p. 2

<sup>4</sup> 'Interrogating the evidence base on humanitarian localization', Humanitarian Advisory Group (2021), p. 9

## Transformation in practice

### Case study 1: [Local response in a global pandemic: a case study of the Red Cross response to Tropical Cyclone Harold during Covid-19 in Vanuatu and Fiji, Australian Red Cross \(Nov. 2020\)](#)

This study explores how the Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) Movement responded to Tropical Cyclone Harold in Vanuatu and Fiji during the Covid-19 pandemic and their experience in supporting localisation in the Pacific. The paper details how pandemic restrictions reduced in-country international surge assistance, and found that "there was there was a shift in the power dynamics between national and international Red Cross actors during the response, with a greater emphasis on local leadership". It emphasises the importance of previous investments in disaster preparedness and longstanding capacity development programs which supported this approach.

Reflecting on the RCRC Movement's response, the paper acknowledges both the advantages and challenges of responding to a natural disaster during a global pandemic and provides insight into how international actors can take on complementary roles in the Pacific context, including by supporting the response remotely,



through technical advice, logistics support and access to fast and accessible funding.

 **Case study 2: When the Rubber Hits the Road: local leadership in the first 100 days of the Rohingya crises response, Humanitarian Advisory Group (HAG) (Dec. 2017)**

This paper assesses the extent to “how much the global localisation agenda influenced operational response in the Rohingya crisis”. It looks at topics such as leadership, funding, surge capacities, partnerships and coordination. The paper notes that “while not much had changed in the way humanitarian action unfolded in Bangladesh”—in terms of funding flows, surge staff and coordination relating to international actors—that “below the surface” power dynamic shifts were taking place. The case study looks at how the Government of Bangladesh “took on a strong leadership position that has challenged the default international systems”. The paper also reflects on how “national and local NGOs are playing a key role in the response”, where “some international actors are partnering with national actors more intentionally”.

 **Case study 3: Locally-Led Humanitarian Response: Reflections on the Haiyan Response Experience of Local Development Organizations, Christian Aid & People’s Disaster Risk Reduction Network (Jan. 2017)**

This report reflects on the experience and lessons of Christian Aid’s NGO partners in responding to the Haiyan emergency response. The paper focuses on identifying good practices, gaps, and challenges to “identify elements that could be built into a framework of a good locally-led humanitarian response”, and explores the questions: “What is a locally-led response?” and “What are the elements that make a locally-led humanitarian action effective?”

 **Case study 4: Syria Relief**

**– Building an organisational structure, Syria Relief and Save the Children**

This case study outlines how civil society organisation (CSO), Syria Relief, built its organisational structure. With support from the IKEA Foundation, this education and training organisation developed a strategic plan, identified its internal gaps and established an internal development department that allowed for the organisation to build and expand its profile, improve its internal structure, train field staff and provide support to community-based organisations (CBOs) inside Syria.

 **Case study 5: Anchored in Local Reality: Case Studies on Local Humanitarian Action from Haiti, Colombia, and Iraq, Oxfam International & Tufts University (Mar. 2020).**

This paper seeks to challenge “the way that the localisation agendas are spoken about, as well as the dichotomy between local and international humanitarian action”. It looks at three distinctly different humanitarian contexts in Haiti, Iraq, and Colombia and explores definitions and concepts exploring the questions: “What does ‘local’ actually mean? Who qualifies as a ‘local humanitarian actor’? What are the goals of these agendas?”

 **Case study 6: Localisation Across Contexts: Lessons learned from four case studies (Indonesia, Kenya, Somalia & South Sudan), Save the Children Denmark & Tufts University (July, 2020).**

This brief provides a summary of research conducted on the “localisation of humanitarian action in several different contexts” –including humanitarian situations in Kenya, Somalia, and South Sudan and the 2018 Sulawesi earthquake response in Indonesia. The goal of the research was to “unpack assumptions related to locally-led humanitarian action and to identify the factors that lead to effective, timely, and principled responses”. It focused largely on connecting with local actors in each humanitarian context to reflect on their experiences. Despite the different scope and contexts of the study’s focus countries, the brief notes that it seeks to “begin to identify lessons learned that may reach beyond these specific emergencies” and outlines several similarities and differences found across localisation processes in different contexts.

 **Case study 7: Stopping as success: Transitioning to locally led development**

Implemented by Peace Direct, Search for Common Ground, and CDA Collaborative Learning, this three-year USAID funded project, ‘Stopping as success: Locally led transitions in development’, is a “collaborative learning project that looks into how to make INGO transitions more responsible”. The project “aims to enable development partnerships to be more locally led” and help development practitioners become “more responsive to local dynamics”.

The consortium also wrote [What transformation takes: Evidence of responsible INGO transitions to locally led development around the world](#), a compilation of 19 case studies from the lifespan of the program, and has developed a range of tools and resources illustrating examples of locally-led transitions.

## INGO commitments to 'transformation':

- [Localisation of humanitarian aid](#), Charter for Change (July 2015; revised version Feb. 2019). The Charter 4 Change is an initiative led by national and international NGOs, with the aim to “practically implement changes to the way the humanitarian system operates to enable more locally-led response” and promote greater recognition and participation of local and national actors. INGO signatories to the Charter are encouraged to shift their own ways of working and commit to realising its eight points around direct funding, partnerships, transparency, recruitment, advocacy, equality, support, and promotion.
- [Our commitments to strengthen localisation and partnership in humanitarian action](#), Caritas Internationalis. Building on its initial organisational position paper outlining its humanitarian commitments, Caritas Internationalis has developed this organisational position paper on supporting the collective commitments made including under workstream two of the Grand Bargain (providing more support and tools to national and local actors), and outlines the commitments members have made to further strengthen localisation and partnership in humanitarian action.
- [Localisation in Practice: Seven Dimensions of Localisation](#), Start Network, Van Brabant, K. & Patel, S. (June 2018). This report aims to highlight several good practices for moving forward the discussions on localisation and outlines specific commitments the Start Network has made to localisation, such as the “Network’s Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme” (DEPP), a three-year programme that was focused on “building national capacity for disasters and emergencies preparedness” in 11 countries.
- [Going Local: Achieving a More Appropriate and Fit-for-Purpose Humanitarian Ecosystem in the Pacific](#), ARC, Ayobi, Y. Black, A. Kenni, L. Nakabea, R. & Sutton, K. (Oct. 2017). This report outlines the key findings and draws out lessons from research conducted across the Pacific, seeking to “improve understanding

of the challenges and opportunities for localisation of humanitarian action in the Pacific region”.

- [Pledge for Change](#), Adeso & Centre for Humanitarian Leadership. The Pledge for Change brings together key INGO leaders for honest conversations about their organisations’ role in maintaining neocolonial structures in the global aid system to create joint strategies and significant steps towards decolonisation.

## Research, reports & policy papers:

- [Policy Brief Localisation – What it means and how to achieve it](#), International Federation of the Red Cross Red Crescent (IFRC) Movement. A policy brief that provides an understanding of a largely agreed definition of what localisation is, what positive impacts it can have for local actors and guidelines for what successful capacity strengthening efforts can look like.
- [Rethinking humanitarian reform: What will it take to truly change the system](#), Centre for Global Development, Saez, P, Konyndyk J & Worden, R. (Sept. 2021). This brief summarises three years of research under the project, ‘Rethinking Humanitarian Reform’, which was funded by the aid departments of Australia and the UK. The projects aimed to better understand the “incentives behind the humanitarian system” and explore ways to “shift them to better prioritise the needs of affected populations”.
- [Humanitarian learning under the COVID-19 pandemic: a pathway to localisation?](#) Humanitarian Leadership Academy (HLA) & London School of Economics, Pawel, M. (July 2021). This research looks at how COVID-19 has had an “unprecedented impact” on the humanitarian sector, both programmatically and operationally. Utilising mixed methodologies, it looks at several opportunities presented by the pandemic “to fast track a shift towards more locally led responses”.

• [Localisation in COVID-19: Experience of Caritas national organisations with humanitarian funding, partnerships and coordination in the COVID-19 pandemic](#), Caritas (June 2021). This report details responses from a survey and over 60 interviews with national Caritas members about their experience of a range of different humanitarian actors' approaches to localisation in the COVID-19 crisis.

• [Bridging the intention to action gap: The future role of intermediaries in supporting locally led humanitarian action](#), Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (June 2021). In consultation with the IASC's co-convenor, the IFRC, and members of the IASC Grand Bargain Localisation Working Group, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation commissioned this project to "explore the future role of organisations when acting as intermediaries", and seeks to "increase clarity and ambition as to how the role of intermediaries should be evolving".

• [Interrogating the evidence base on humanitarian localisation: A literature study](#), Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG), Overseas Development Institute (ODI) & HAG, Barbelet, V. Davies, G. Flint, J. & Davey, E. (June 2021). Commissioned by the the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, this paper reviews the existing evidence base on 'localisation' and local humanitarian action and offers recommendations for donors in the context of the "drive towards more locally led responses".

• [Local humanitarian leadership: The view from local actors](#), Oxfam (May 2021). This study seeks to "capture and synthesise the experience, practice, and learning of Oxfam in the Philippines" following its rollout of its 2016 "Local Humanitarian Leadership strategy", offering recommended actions for donors and international actors. The intent is for the lessons to "contribute to advancing the understanding and application of LHL" among humanitarian actors.

• [Localisation or deglobalisation? East Asia and the dismantling of liberal humanitarianism](#), Gómez, O. A. *Third World Quarterly*, 42:6, (Mar. 2021). This paper reviews the history of humanitarian action in

East Asia, looking at "how the region's agency was essential to accommodate the foundations of liberal humanitarianism during the Cold War and, in the last two decades, to contest them". The author argues that "instead of localisation, a process of deglobalisation is taking shape in the region", and posits that this is "based on increased national ownership of crisis response, privileging reciprocal, bilateral support over multilateral action, and legitimating the rejection of unnecessary support".

• [Unpacking localisation](#), HLA & International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) (Oct. 2020). This paper was developed to "support local, national, and international NGOs to 'unpack' localisation in a constructive manner". The authors propose that "one approach is to consider localisation as the intersection of four subprocesses"—political and identity; quality and accountability; operations and effectiveness, and financial and efficiency considerations—which are "taking place simultaneously, in some cases working in parallel, in others working together or against each other".

• [Turning the Tables: Insights from locally-led humanitarian partnerships in conflict-affected situations](#), Save the Children Sweden & Saferworld (May 2020). A study commissioned by Save the Children Sweden that builds on work the organisation and Saferworld have been doing with local and national civil society actors and vulnerable people "to re-imagine and re-design" how actors work together in conflict-affected situations and presents cases and examples of locally-led crisis response.

• [Protection in Local Response to Disasters: Challenges and insights from the Pacific Region](#), HPG, Fast, L & Sutton, K (Oct. 2018). This research initiative from the ODI's HPG, HAG, and the Australian Red Cross (ARC) seeks "to understand the impact of localised humanitarian protection in disaster preparedness and response". The paper outlines prospects for "effective protection in a locally-led response", including benefits, opportunities and challenges.

- [Aid Localisation: Humanitarian Aid on the move](#), no.19, Groupe URD, Karroum, N. (Jan. 2018). This article is based on a study on aid localisation during the response to Hurricane Matthew which struck Haiti in October 2016. It draws on a series of interviews undertaken in Haiti and presents reasons as to “how and why” localisation efforts can be a way to “reinforce the resilience of Haitian society in the face of regular natural disasters”, as well as analysing the limitations that were observed.
- [Changing humanitarian practice on localisation and inclusion across the nexus](#), ALNAP Paper, Christoplos, I., Hassouna, M. and Desta, G. (2018). This study examines “field-level practice” linked to localisation and inclusion work being implemented across the humanitarian-development nexus in two contrasting country settings: Lebanon and Ethiopia.
- [More than the Money: Localisation in Practice](#), Group URD and Trócaire, De Geoffroy, V., Grunewald, F & Ní Chéilleachair R. (2017). This paper provides views from local and national humanitarian actors to understand key barriers to achieving localisation under the framework of the Grand Bargain, and offers recommendations on how to “further strengthen partnership work with local actors in humanitarian settings”.
- [The Future of Aid INGOs in 2030](#), Inter-Agency Regional Analysts Network (IARAN) (2017). This report presents an analysis of the “potential evolutions of the humanitarian ecosystem and the global environment in which it operates by 2030”. The paper employs foresight analysis to assess the global drivers of change across three areas: “global changes, types of humanitarian needs and crisis, and the humanitarian ecosystem”. The authors then identify 23 topics that underpin these subsections and examine the “trends and uncertainties for each topic to help develop an understanding of the forces that can shape the future”.
- [NEAR – Network for Empowered Aid Response: Update on Progress since the World Humanitarian Summit](#), Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR) (Aug. 2017). This paper provides an overview on commitments, activities and initiatives that have

been taken forward by Network members since the 2016 WHS, including the main barriers and challenges to progress, a case study example, and recommendations for advancing the initiative.

- [The Challenges of Localised Humanitarian Aid in Armed Conflict](#), Center for Applied Reflection on Humanitarian Practice, MSF Emergency Gap Series 03, Schenkenberg, A. (Nov. 2016). This paper looks at “the role of national and local actors in humanitarian action, based on MSF’s experiences in areas within conflict affected countries”. The author examines, from both conceptual and practical perspectives, the “constraints and challenges that confront these actors when delivering humanitarian assistance, especially in situations of (internal) armed conflict”.
- [Localisation in Humanitarian Practice](#), HPG and ICVA, El Taraboulsi, S. Schell, J. & Gorgeu, R. (May 2016). This paper considers the benefits and challenges of localisation and posits that while the humanitarian system “ought to embrace localisation, the burden of a response must not be placed solely on the shoulders of local actors” and instead, “international actors must be committed to a shared responsibility by reinforcing, not replacing local systems”.
- [Local Perspective on Protection: Recommendations for a Community based Approach to Protection in Humanitarian Action](#), Local to Global Protection (L2GP). This paper presents lessons from a “community-based protection” study and offers practitioners a set of recommendations on how they can strengthen the protection of people and communities. The authors conclude this can be strengthened by “placing locally rooted strategies and experiences at the centre of the planning and implementation of programming in humanitarian action”.

## Conceptual frameworks, guides & tools:

- [COVID-19: tracking local humanitarian action and complementary partnerships](#), HPG ODI. This tool collates resources and examples of local actors responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and seeks to “collate evidence of change in practice at different levels”.
- [Mapping for the shifting of power: a system change approach](#), Bond, Hodgson J. & Vargas Pritchard, Y. (Oct. 2021). This mapping aims to highlight “organisations and initiatives that are taking different approaches to disrupting power imbalances and shifting to locally owned development”. It looks at approaches to supporting locally-led transitions, including thematic areas of governance structures and donors’ policies and practice. Participants were invited to “identify who they go to for advice and how often”, with the approach of reflecting “the number and strength of their relationships with others in the system, as well as how they are perceived”.
- [Localisation Performance Measurement Framework](#), Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR) (2020). The purpose of this tool is to track progress made towards reaching localisation commitments. Primarily geared towards use by local and national actors, it can also be relevant and informative to INGOs, donors, and research and academic institutions.
- [Five Ways to Support Locally Led Disaster Response in the Pacific During Covid-19](#), PIANGO & HAG (April 2020). This research brief provides an overview on ways that humanitarian actors can support locally-led disaster response in the Pacific during COVID-19. Drawing on lessons learnt from past humanitarian responses, and current discussions around localisation in the context of COVID-19, it offers recommendations for strengthening partnerships between international and national actors; implementing new and flexible ways of working; and supporting a locally-led response by funding local and national actors.

## • Intention to impact: Localisation of humanitarian action research project, HAG:

- [Measuring Localisation: Framework and Tools](#), HAG (Dec. 2019). This paper outlines an approach to measure the activity and impact of localised humanitarian action and proposes several tools along with a framework “that humanitarian actors can adapt for their own organisational purposes, during a response or at a country level”.
- [Intention to Impact: Measuring Localisation](#), HAG, Flint, J. & Lia, A. (Feb. 2018). As the initial building blocks of the HAG’s Intention to Impact research project, this paper reviews available resources on localisation, both qualitative and quantitative, looking at the current approaches to existing measurement approaches, the gaps and challenges with these approaches and offers a proposed framework and a number of approaches to measuring localisation.
- [17 Rooms-X](#), Brookings Institution & The Rockefeller Foundation (Sept. 2018). 17 Rooms-X is a methodology that seeks to help communities with a process “for any scale of community” to engage with the SDGs and to help “identify specific forms of cooperation to drive progress”.
- [A new way to think about localisation in humanitarian response](#), Start Network (Dec. 2017). Offers resources and a video that discusses the Network’s proposed framework for localisation, which seeks to provide a “practical structure to improve the position of local organisations within international aid”. The materials cover a range of topics from funding, partnerships and participation, to the influence of local and national organisations.
- [Advancing the Localisation Agenda in Protection Coordination Groups](#), Global Protection Cluster, Nolan, A. & Dozin, M. (2019). This paper presents the learnings from a localisation initiative by the Global Protection Cluster that was piloted in seven countries over the course of 2017–2018, which outlines key trends and lessons, good practices, and recommendations, and offers approaches and tools for advancing the localisation agenda.

• [Conceptual Framework for Localisation in Coordination](#), Global Education Cluster. This conceptual framework is developed by Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) of the Global Education Cluster, and emphasises that “clusters have a central position in fostering the localisation process” and through the framework highlights five key dimensions and possible action points.

• [Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream](#) (hosted by IFRC). Collates a number of tools, resources and guidance notes for local and national responders including on capacity strengthening, arrangements between donors and intermediaries, and partnership practices for localisation and a resource toolkit for country-level dialogue on localisation.

• [Save the Children's Resource Centre: Localisation](#), Save the Children. In seeking to “contribute to the sector supporting locally led action”, Save the Children’s resource site collates 140+ resources, reports, and case studies on localisation.

## Other interesting reads:

• [Localisation and local humanitarian action](#), *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine* (May 2021). The authors explore capacity-strengthening and localisation links, concluding that “there is increasing consensus at policy and normative level, underscored by the COVID-19 pandemic, that local leadership should be supported and is a more effective approach”.

• [A moment in time: COVID, localisation and the Pacific – Learning from COVID-19 to progress locally led response and development](#), ARC, HAG & the Institute for Human Security and Social Change, La Trobe University (Dec. 2020). A think piece reflecting on several research initiatives depicting some of the learnings from COVID-19 crisis in progressing locally led humanitarian response and development in the Pacific and outlining some common themes arising from these learnings.

• [Is it finally time for the localisation agenda to take off?](#) (June 2020). This opinion piece discusses opportunities and challenges for civil society leadership in different regional contexts including Africa and the Pacific, particularly in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and outlines ways to support more locally led decision-making.

• [Accelerate your commitments’ during COVID-19 – an open letter to donors](#) (April 2020). NEAR Network, Civicus, and the Global Fund for Community Foundations wrote an open letter calling for donors to “accelerate their commitments and ensure a lasting and stronger local civil society in the global south, both during the COVID-19 emergency response and beyond”.

• [An open letter to International NGOs who are looking to ‘localise’ their operations](#), Open Democracy (Mar. 2020). Over 145 organisations signed an open letter to INGOs, calling for INGOs to “help grassroots organisations create the structures to fundraise for themselves and sustain their work”, instead of approaching the global South to “raise money ‘domestically’ through affiliate entities”, highlighting the “need to be supported, not competed with”.

## Podcasts, conversations & platforms:

• [Aid Re-imagined](#) is an initiative that seeks to “help usher the evolution of aid towards justice and effectiveness”.

• [Bondcast Podcast, Episode 8 - Is the international NGO system broken?](#) brings together practitioners to discuss localisation, resourcing and “how to truly shift the power”.

• [Disasters: Deconstructed](#) reflects on “human society” from a range of different disciplinary and ideological perspectives that seeks to better understand the root causes of disasters.

• [Disrupt Development](#) is an “innovation academy in global development” that aims to work with actors in the aid and development sector seeking systems change. Disrupt Developments’ [Partos Future](#)

[Exploration](#) podcast “shares stories behind disruptive thinkers and doers within sustainable development”.

- [Humanitarian Practice Network](#) (HPN), established in 1994, is a forum for policymakers, practitioners and others “working in or on the humanitarian sector to share and disseminate information, analysis and experience”.

- [Poverty to Power](#) is intended to be a conversation that seeks to foster the exchange of “opinion, argument and on-the-ground experience” about the aid and development sector.

- [Rethinking humanitarianism](#) is a podcast series “exploring the future of humanitarian aid” where co-hosts Heba Aly, director of *The New Humanitarian*, and Jeremy Konyndyk from the Center for Global Development “discuss the drivers of change affecting international aid”.

- [#ShiftThePower](#) launched in 2016 by the Global Fund for Community Foundations, is a movement and a call to action for “new behaviours, mindsets, and ways of working” in the sector.

- [The challenges of localised aid in conflict](#) (2016). ODI and the Active Learning Network for ALNAP co-host a podcast talking with humanitarian practitioners from local and international organisations on “the nuances of different humanitarian contexts and their distinct operational challenges”.

- [The Future of Humanitarian Action: Perspectives on Change](#), Devex Partnerships. This is a series of conversations from a range of “thought leaders” discussing current humanitarian issues and looking at ways to make the “shifting and sharing of power to communities a reality”.

- [Trumanitarian](#) is a podcast series debating the “deeper, structural issues holding the sector back from transforming”.

## In the spotlight: Some advocates, networks, and communities to follow on Twitter:

- Aarathi Krishnan, Strategic Foresight Advisor at UNDP and Tech and Human Rights Fellow with a focus on decolonising technology: [@akrishnan23](#)

- Alexander Betts, Professor of Forced Migrations and International Affairs, University of Oxford: [@alexander\\_betts](#)

- Arbie Baguios, founder of Aid Re-Imagined and advocate for the decolonisation of project management in the sector: [@arbiebaguios](#)

- Degan Ali, Executive Director ADESCO Africa and advocate on the need for transformation to give more power and voice to local communities and CSOs in the aid sector: [@DeganAli](#)

- Heba Aly, Journalist and co-host of Rethinking Humanitarianism: [@HebaJournalist](#)

- Hugo Slim, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict, Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford: [@HSlim\\_Oxford](#)

- Husni Husni, Adviser on Accountability to Affected People for UNOCHA and former Regional Community Engagement & Accountability Adviser for IFRC: [@husni\\_portraits](#)

- Marie Rose Romain Mu, Advocate for community-led transformational change: [@romainmurphy](#)

- Tobias Denskus, Associate Professor in Development, Malmouni University: [@aidnography](#)

- Themrise Khan, researcher specialising in international development, social policy, gender and global migration: [@themrise](#)

## Networks & Forums:

- Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief & development (ACBAR) aims to provide a platform for information-sharing and networking for and between national and international NGOs in Afghanistan: [@ACBAR\\_AFG](#)
- Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network (ADRRN) is a “network of national civil society organisations in the Asia-Pacific region” that works towards “building resilience” in a range of areas, from awareness raising and advocacy to capacity building: [@ADRRN1](#)
- Centre for Transformational Change, seeks to cultivate “community-led power shift for just futures”: [@cftchange](#)
- Charter4Change, an initiative that aims to “practically implement changes to the way the Humanitarian System operates to enable more locally-led response”: [@Charter4Change](#)
- Institute for Human Security and Social Change, at Latrobe University seeks to “actively contribute to progressive social change” in Australia and globally: [@IHSSC](#)
- National Alliance of Humanitarian Actors, Bangladesh (NAHAB), seeks to facilitate local and nationals to “have a stronger voice and representation in humanitarian platforms, networks and national disaster management structure”: [@NAHABbd](#)
- National Refugee-led Advisory and Advocacy Group, is an Australian refugee-led entity to inform and influence policy and public discourse on refugees and people seeking asylum: [@NraagAus](#)
- Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR), is a network of NGOs, comprising both local and national organisations from the Global South: [@NEAR\\_Network](#)
- PIANGO Pacific 2030, is a regional network of umbrella NGOs from 24 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) who are “rethinking Development and Reshaping the Pacific We Want By 2030”: [@Pacific\\_2030](#)
- Rethinking Development fosters conversations around power, ethics, systemic challenges, and lessons learnt: [@rethinkingdevp](#)
- Sphere India: National Coalition of Humanitarian Agencies in India is a “nexus of diverse stakeholders of humanitarian, DRR, Climate Risk management, Development, Peacebuilding actors” that aims to provide a platform to “promote quality and accountability”: [@sphereindia](#)
- Somalia NGO Consortium is a coordination mechanism of NGOs focused on supporting an “enabling environment” for delivery of humanitarian and development outcomes Their website offers a number of country-specific localisation and local leadership resources: [@NGOConsortium](#)
- The New Humanitarian, initially founded by the UN in 1995, has become an independent non-profit news organisation focused on “covering crises and disasters—and in holding the aid industry accountable”: [@newhumanitarian](#)
- Transforming Surge Capacity from the Start Network, seeks to transform emergency surge capacity through piloting and building evidence on collaborative and locally focused approaches to surge: [@Transform\\_Surge](#)
- Yemeni Development Network for NGOs aims to enhance civil society work through organisational and capacity building, coordination, and partnerships with national and international partners: [@ydnorg\\_ye](#)



CENTRE FOR  
HUMANITARIAN  
LEADERSHIP



Rights  
CoLAB

This project was developed in partnership with the [RINGO Project](#), hosted by [Rights CoLab](#). Many thanks to the IKEA Foundation for supporting the initiative.

The RINGO Project is a systems change initiative that seeks to transform global civil society to respond to today's challenges, aimed at reimagining the role of the international non-governmental organisation.

As a part of the project, this thematic series maps various initiatives under key areas that cover decolonisation, finance and funding models, technology, leadership, ways of working, partnerships, and business operating models.

The purpose of this resource is for the use of practitioners in keeping up to date with the evolving discussions in this area, and promoting greater awareness of actions, knowledge-sharing, and collaboration among humanitarian actors of the role of INGOs in spearheading, facilitating, or supporting change in the sector.

The Centre for Humanitarian Leadership is an innovative collaboration between Deakin University and Save the Children that combines good humanitarian practice with academic rigour. Our mission is to lead and influence change within the humanitarian system through critical analysis, transformational and disruptive education and research, and meaningful contributions to policy and practice.

Rights CoLab is an open platform for facilitating collaborative efforts to advance human rights, among experts with diverse perspectives in the fields of civil society, technology, business and finance.

